सर, इसमें जो तीसरा और आखिरी प्वायंट मैं कहना चाहती हूँ, वह यह है कि इस कानून के कारण बहुत फायदे हुए। निश्चित रूप में इसमें स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का भी रोल होना चाहिए। जहाँ स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स की कमियाँ हैं, मैं खुद जानती हूँ, मेरे अपने प्रदेश बंगाल में मंत्री जी खुद वहाँ आए, हम उस मीटिंग में थे, आपने खुद discuss करके, जायजा लेकर बताया कि कहाँ-कहाँ कमियाँ हैं, कहाँ हमें क्या करना है और co-operative तरीके से हमने उसका हल निकालने की कोशिश की। अभी आँकड़ों से स्पष्ट है कि बहुत सुधार हुआ है। अभी भी हमारी कमियाँ हैं, हमें दूर करना है। केरल में भी यह position है और त्रिपुरा में तो सबसे बढ़िया position है। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का एक रोल है, मैं मानती हूँ। लेकिन हमारे साथियों ने यहाँ जो सुझाव दिया कि सेंटर दारोगा बन कर, सेंटर स्टेट को जा कर कहे कि यह करो, वह करो, मैं आपसे यह हाथ जोड़ कर कहती हूँ कि यह अधिकार सेंटर को न दें। मंत्री जी अपनी तरफ से बहुत सहयोग कर रहे हैं। सर, मैं इसको मानती हूँ कि मॉनिटरिंग का मैकेनिज्म जरूर हो, लेकिन इस रूप में नहीं, जो कहा जा रहा है, क्योंकि ...(व्यवधान)...

GOVERNMENT BILL

The Jawaharlal Institute of Post-graduate Medical Education and Research, Puducherry Bill, 2007 — *(Contd.)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mrs. Brinda Karat, I am not asking you to finish. You please resume your seat for a minute.

Now, I think, it is one hour. Dr. Ramdoss, you were to report back to the House after one hour and one hour is over. What I wish to ask is, if you don't want to continue with the Bill, then say so, so that the House will go ahead accordingly. The Bill is the property of the House. The House has decided that after one hour the Bill will be taken up. You have every right to suggest that the Bill may be taken up either tomorrow or later. Then, I will take the sense of the House.

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (DR. ANBUMANI RAMDOSS): Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the House certain facts about the JIPMER Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): So, you are speaking on the Bill.

DR. ANBUMANI RAMDOSS: Sir, I just want to explain something. By taking this opportunity, Sir, I wish to explain the situation about this Bill. There are a number of observations made by the hon. Members. I am happy to reply the same. As mentioned in the Bill, the JIPMER is an institute of national importance. The JIPMER, AIIMS and PGI, Chandigarh are the three institutes set up more than fifty years ago which envisages as a centre of excellence. The PGI, Chandigarh and the AIIMS, at that point of time, were made as a centre of excellence through an Act of Parliament and the JIPMER was left out. There were a lot of Committees which, at that point of time, in the early 60s, recommended that the JIPMER should also be made as a centre of excellence under an Act of Parliament. Even after fifty years, none of the observation/recommendations of Committees was implemented. There has been a lot of activity in the Institute. I will answer all the queries raised by the hon. Members. Sir, even though I was born in Puducherry and this Institute is there in Puducherry, as a doctor, as a professional myself, I know how the Institute has been functioning in the last 25 years. Sir, it was a centre of excellence at one point of time and if you see the graph, it came down. The efficiency, functioning of the Institute came down. Mr. Narayanasamy was saying that there is no neurologist in the Institute. Since the last $3^1/_2$ years, after the UPA

Government had taken over, now, we have been trying to restructure the Institute. There have been administrative problems earlier. People were asking why it should be made as an autonomous. Some people are asking why it should not be made autonomous. So, there is a little confusion. On the one hand, some people want autonomy, and, on the other, people do not want autonomy. I do not know which way to follow. On some issues, people very strongly say that autonomy should be maintained and there should not be any interference with its autonomy and here we are trying to give autonomy to the Institute and some of them are opposing for the reasons best known to them.

So, I am not able to understand this duplicity of policies. This institute, geographically, is in the Southern-most part of the country. We have institutes, like, the Safdarjang Hospital, the RML Hospital and the JIPMER, which come under the Central Health Service. The PGIMR and the AIIMS come under the statute. Since it is in the Southern most part of the country, a lot of activities do not happen there. Even though there have been financial allocations to the institute, but these have not been fully observed. And, as hon. Narayanasamy has said, "When you think of putting any query or writing letters, one year is done." Here, in the RML Hospital and the Safdarjang Hospital, accessibility of officers is there to get the things done then and there. But due to geographical reasons, there are no functions, nothing happens. Then, there is another component of the programme, that is, the appointments by the UPSC. The UPSC takes one to two years to complete the appointment procedure, interviews, etc., and appoint a doctor. Then, half of the doctors do not join because of the geographical farness. And, those who join, they want transfer to Delhi or in the Northern part of the country. Because of this, nearly 50-60 per cent vacancies were lying vacant in the JIPMER, before we took over. And, what to say, even the CT machine, though it was a new one, was not functioning there. After I took over, within a span of one week the scan machine started functioning. So, such was the state of affair.

Incidentally, I, the Minister, happen to be from that part of the country. Things are happening. We are giving more allocation and concentration to that. But I am not going to be here permanently. As Shrimati Brindaji was saying, there were, cutting across the party lines, a lot of animosity or the agitations. I would like to state that the major parties in Puducherry have supported this proposal. The major parties, who are ruling there, who have the maximum MLAs and MPs, have supported this proposal of providing autonomy. We have gone into the pros and cons of the issue. We had series of discussions. I myself had discussions with the employees and with other parties. My officers had so many discussions. My Secretary had discussions. Members of Parliament, both, from the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, had discussions with them. There were some apprehensions too. But saying that the entire institute opposes it, is not completely true. Almost all the doctors and all the categories of staff want this autonomy. I have been getting so many letters that they wanted this statute, for a long time, for its improvement, for its academic excellence, for it to have its own curriculum. The JIPMER students are there all over the world, and wherever I would go, they would insist that there should be a statute because no institute, no hospital can function with 50-60 per cent of posts lying vacant. Till about two years ago, there was no Neurologist. If any accident victim would go there, they would refer him to the Government Hospital, Puducherry. And, this was supposed to be a centre of excellence! But, nothing was happening. That's why we need a statute; we need a governing body to function within the rules of Parliament. And, we are all willing to support the financial component.

Sir, Mr. Narayanasamy is right in saying that patients, from all over the country go there.

He was also saying that funds were not being properly utilized earlier. But we have been taking a lot of measures and steps to streamline the administrative functioning and sort out the various problems. We are trying to focus on providing better patient care and all that. He also said that reservation policy was to be safeguarded. Definitely, it is the policy of the Government to safeguard the reservation policy of the JIPMER in Puducherry. The poor patients will be treated free of cost. It is definitely the policy of the UPA Government, whether it is the AIIMS or the PGIMR or any other institution, run by the Government of India, to treat all poor people free of cost. And, we are treating them totally free of cost. We don't charge them. And, it is not only for Below the Poverty Line patients only, but, even for poor patients who say that we cannot afford and we are treating them. It is not that when it becomes a statute, the costs are going to be increased. Definitely, it is not going to be increased.

There was a suggestion that the fee structure of the students should not be altered. I would like to assure Smt. Brinda Karat that the fee structure for the students will not be altered. But, then, as she wants, I don't think there is any Act, which says that the present fee structure should be protected. It cannot be mentioned in any Act. I am willing to mention it in the rules as such. As an Administrator, she also knows and all the Members of Parliament know that this present clause for which she has moved an amendment cannot be brought under the Bill *per se*. It could be brought under the rules. The rules could be changed then and there, but not the Bill, which she wants to be done.

About allocation of funds, I would like to assure Mr. Narayanasamy that all the funds necessary to upgrade are being given. In fact, last year, we had given nearly about Rs. 180 crores upgradation and we are trying to do that. We have given even more than that. He also mentioned about employees. Yes, Sir, we have given employees one-year time to choose whether they want to be in the present structure or move to the newer structure. All the departments related to heart surgery, orthopaedic etc., definitely, all these will be taken care of.

My colleague, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Health, Shri Amar Singhji was telling us about poor patients. Definitely, poor patients will be taken care of. This is an assurance from the Government. He was also asking about the Standing Committee's recommendations. He also knows that most of the recommendations of the Standing Committee have been accepted and incorporated. All the hon. Members know about it. Definitely, we have to work in tandem. Both the Ministry as well as the Standing Committee on Health are working and will work in tandem.

Sir, I have already replied to Smt. Brinda Karat about the agitation and the objective. We are also willing to accept the amendment, which she is bringing with the objective to continue to provide patient care delivery services free of cost for poor patients. Definitely, we are willing to concede to that to bring it under the Bill.

About the fee structure, I have already mentioned. Smt. Brinda Karat said that it should be brought under the Bill. Definitely, legally and administratively also, I don't think there is such an Act where the protection of fee structure is mentioned. Tomorrow, the fee structure could be lowered. That was, again, one suggestion given by her. Smt. Brindaji needs to take notice of that. I request her not to be insistent on bringing it under the Bill. Rather, we will, definitely, bring it under the rules. Accordingly, whatever it is, we will solve the problem the way she feels like.

Shri Thirunavukkarasar mentioned about the issues of students and employees. All of them will be protected. I can give a categorical assurance that they will be protected.

Dr. Maitreyan also mentioned that he does not want autonomy for this hospital. I don't know the policies of his party whether they want autonomy or not. Some Members have deviated from autonomy. I did not understand their policies.

Shri Abani Roy wanted to know why it should be made autonomous. That is why, I have given the reason that most of the people are poor.

Mr. Ekanath Thakur's clause has already been modified. We have moved it and it has already been modified. The clause has been deleted. I have already brought in this amendment.

Mrs. Brinda Karat also brought the amendment and suggested that at page 8, lines 16—20 have to be removed. Those have been removed and modified. This has been, officially, brought as an amendment.

Sir, with these words, once again I request my hon. colleagues here to take up this. Since this is an institute which has not been doing well in the last year, give it more life and bring it under a statute, so that it could be governed within that framework and responsible to the Parliament. Sir, today it is under the Health Ministry. The Health Ministry could do anything with the Institute and say, increase the fee structure or increase everything. Definitely, we are *pro-aam aadmi*. My Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singhji, is very much insisting that all should be taken care of. The poor patients and the students should be taken care of. As a responsible Government, we should go forward on those issues. That is why we want this. I request, once again, Shrimati Brinda Karat to withdraw her first amendment, because we are accepting the other amendments made by her, but only the fee structure. Again, I would like to say that fee structure can't be brought under the Act. As a responsible administrator, she also knows that. We are saying that we will try to bring it under the rule structure, which I request her to accept. With these words...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, the point that I have made is this Bill is coming in some context; that is why, I cannot withdraw this amendment. What is the context? There is already a fee structure which is helping the poor students. Please see, "demand and receive such fees and other charges". What does it mean? It means you are giving an invitation to raise the fees. There is a struggle going on there at present. I am very sorry, Sir. I really appreciate what the hon. Minister has said, but I deeply regret, Sir, I am not able to withdraw my amendment. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister to kindly accept the amendment as part of the Act; otherwise, you are forcing me to press it. I am really sorry.

DR. ANBUMANI RAMDOSS: Sir, I, once again, request her, because, even today, we can increase the fees. It does not need an autonomy or a statute to increase the fees. Even today we can increase the fees ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, what they can do today has not been discussed in the House, but what will be done tomorrow is being discussed in the House. Tomorrow, if my vote is required to ensure that the fees remain the same, my vote will be for the poor students; I cannot accept it. Sir, I am really sorry; I can't.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): What is your opinion, Mr. Minister?

DR. ANBUMANI RAMDOSS: Sir, if this is the case, then I will have to take it back to the Cabinet and get the Prime Minister's approval for this.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Yes, please take it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, the hon. Minister would like to take the Bill back to the Cabinet for getting the approval of the suggested amendment. I hope the House agrees for that. Does he have the permission of the House to defer the Bill?

The Bill was, by leave, deferred.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Prof. P.J. Kurien): So, the Bill is taken back for reconsideration *(Interruptions)*.. No, it is not withdrawn. With the consent of the House, it is only a postponement.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Sir, this Bill remains the property of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): That is why I took the consent of the House.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: I know your experience, Sir. If the Bill is introduced and goes to the Standing Committee, it remains the property of the House. But, here, the hon. Minister has said that he will take it back to the Cabinet. In that case, how can it remain the property of the House? That is the question I am asking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): See, this is consequent upon the amendment moved by Shrimati Brinda Karat. Shrimati Brinda Karat wants her amendment to be incorporated in the Bill. For that purpose only, the hon. Minister needs the consent of the Cabinet. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He did not say that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Let me complete.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He should simply say that to meet the requirements of the House, or, demand of the House, I have to go back to the Cabinet and take the consent. He should say that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): That is what he said. It is there on record. Therefore, knowing that it is the property of the House; I asked for the consent of the House, and the House gave its consent. The House is supreme. All right; now, we will continue with the Short Duration Discussion; Brindaji, you can continue your speech.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I would like to ask one thing. Whether we are taking up the second Short Duration Discussion today or not.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): How is it possible? Where is the time?

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: So, it will be taken up tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think the Treasury Benches have to say.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Will the second Short Duration Discussion be taken up tomorrow?

SHRI SURESH PACHOURI: Which Short Duration Discussion?

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: The second one.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN (West Bengal): Sir, I have a submission to make. The second Short Duration Discussion should be taken up today. If, at all, it cannot be taken up today, we want a commitment here from the Government that it will be taken up tomorrow; otherwise, let

us take it up today itself. It must be taken up.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके जरिए माननीय सदस्यों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि जो सरकार है, वह गवर्नमेंट बिल्स के बारे में कुछ कहने की स्थिति में रहती है, लेकिन जहां तक Short duration discussion या Call attention का प्रश्न है, इस संबंध में माननीय सभापति महोदय को निर्णय लेना होता है कि किस समय और किस तारीख को इसको लिस्ट करना है, इसलिए मैं यही कह सकता हूँ कि सरकार की ओर से इस विषय पर चर्चा हो, हम इस बात के पक्षधर हैं, जब भी और जिस समय भी और जितने समय के लिए भी, इसको लिस्ट किया जाएगा, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, let us continue the Short Duration Discussion. Brindaji, please continue your speech. But your party's time is over. Ten minutes are over. The rest is *ex-gratia*.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: No; Sir, I do not want any *ex-gratia*.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, what happened to the second Short Duration Discussion?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The Government has made the position clear. I have nothing to say on that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, I want your assurance as to whether it would come tomorrow. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No; that is for the Chairman to decide. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, I am asking you. You are the representative of the ...*(Interruptions)*... I want an assurance that it will ... ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Your feelings will also be communicated to the Chairman by the Government ...*(Interruptions)*... and the Chairman may take appropriate decision. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is on record. Whatever you said is on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, it is an important issue which cannot be passed over like this. This is my submission. ...*(Interruptions)*... I may kindly be given an assurance that it will be taken up tomorrow. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Your feeling will be communicated to the Chairman. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR (Maharashtra): It is the feeling of the House that it will be taken up tomorrow. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is the feeling of the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी (राजस्थान): महोदय, मेरा Point of Order है ..**(व्यवधान)**..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): For point of order, you have to quote the rules.

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी: महोदय, मेरा Point of Order है। मेरा यह निवेदन है, क्योंकि यह लिस्ट में आ गया है, इसीलिए यह हाउस की प्रोपर्टी हो गई। मेरा निवेदन है, आप हाउस से कन्सेन्ट ले लेजिए कि कल हो जाएगा, चेयरमैन साहब की इसमें सहमति हो जाएगी। जब यह हाउस की प्रापर्टी हो गई है ..**(व्यवधान)**..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I will tell you. See, it is in the list for today's Business. Today, it is the property of the House. We can finish it today. If it is not taken up

today, then it is for the Chairman to decide whether to take it up tomorrow or not. ...*(Interruptions)*... Your feelings will be communicated to the Chairman. ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes; it will be communicated. The hon. Minister has already said this. Now, Brindaji please.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, my last point is this. आपको यह सलाह दी जा रही है कि आप कोई "सुप्रीम मोनिटरिंग बोर्ड" बनाएं और फिर सब जगह जाकर उस रूप में करें। वैसे भी इस एक्ट के मुताबिक एक "Central Advisory Council" है, वह "Central Advisory Council" मोनिटरिंग कर रही है और आपको पूरी रिपोर्ट दे रही है, स्टेट में भी "Central Advisory Council" है, उसके आधार पर अगर आप मेकेनिज्म को और मजबूत कर सकें, इस एक्ट को लागू करने के लिए कुछ कारगर कदम उठा सकते हैं, तो वही कीजिए, कोई अलग से मोनिटरिंग मेकेनिज्म की जरूरत नहीं है। इसी के साथ, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को एक बार फिर बधाई देना चाहती हूँ कि लगातार इस कानून को लागू करने के लिए वह बहुत ही प्रयास कर रहे हैं और मैं उम्मीद करती हूँ कि इस साल यानी जो आने वाला साल है, उसमें भी Demand-driven का मतलब वाकई में हमारे rules में जो कमियां हैं, उनको हटाकर, उसके डिमाण्ड को और बढ़ाकर हमारे देश की गरीब जनता को और राहत पहुंचायी जाए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN(PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Shri D. Raja; not present. Dr. K. Malaisamy. ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes; please.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I appreciate the distinguished Lady Member Brinda's contribution pertaining to this Bill. Possibly, it is the first time in the history of Indian Parliament and that too in the Rajya Sabha that even after due scrutiny of the Standing Committee, after due scrutiny of the Cabinet, after due official amendments of the Government and after due consideration of the various suggestions, we have to take the Bill to the Cabinet again. If the Cabinet agrees, it is a different thing. It is true, Sir, that we, the Congress Party, alone cannot pass it without the support of the House and other supporting parties. If this becomes the situation, we will have to rethink what kind of a Bill we can bring

5.00 P.M.

forward from the Cabinet, because I cannot insult the House and the Standing Committee's collective observation and the majority's recommendations because the Standing Committee rules say that it is not mandatory; the Government can accept as much as possible. And if the hon. Minister accepts a few of the changes, it is very reasonable and gracious of him. But I do not know of any Government which accepts even the semicolons, full stops of every amendment. Sir, it is very unfortunate and embarrassing for us. I concede that we will take it back to the Cabinet and if we feel it proper, we will come back to the House. Otherwise, let the people of Pondicherry decide what should be the fate of this institution.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Situation Arising Out Of Misuse Of Funds Provided By Central Government Under National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme —*Contd.*

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I hasten to appreciate the opening batsman, Mr. Narayanasamy, who has been very forthright in culling out the various lapses in the implementation of the scheme. In fact, he has been pointing out in great details the various lapses which are taking place in various States. My only grievance